Technical report (University of North Carolina at Greensboro. Home Economics Center for Research); no. 4

Establishment of a Training Center for Infant-Toddler Care:

Evaluation Report

TX
173
T290
no. 4

By

Ann Harrison

J. Allen Watson

INTRODUCTION

The Home Economics Center for Research contracted with Mrs. Aurelia Mazyck to evaluate the "Establishment of a Training Center for Infant-Toddler Care." The project took place during the Fall of 1972 and Winter of 1973. A similar contract had been awarded the Home Economics Center for Research by Dr. Mary Elizabeth Keister during the first half of 1972.

The major purpose of the project was to provide training for those persons involved in the delivery of services to infants and toddlers, i.e., administrators, supervisors, planners, consultants, trainers, and others. This purpose was to be implemented by providing a variety of training opportunities for those in the field of infant-toddler care.

Such a training project was a logical extension of Dr. Keister's program. The Demonstration Nursery Center for Infants and Toddlers has been in operation since 1967 and has been recognized nationally for its excellence and pioneering accomplishments. Since it is generally agreed that child-care services, especially those for infants and toddlers, are both qualitatively and quantitatively inadequate to meet the needs, there is a substantial gap to be filled in training personnel to staff and manage service programs. The staff of the Demonstration Nursery collectively possessed a wealth of valuable experience and know-how which needed to be transmitted to others in the field. The route chosen for this information dissemination was the announcement of two workshops: "Program Essentials of Infant-Toddler Care," and "Infant-Toddler Care --- Training and Consultation." This is the second year that these workshops have been evaluated by the Home Economics Center for Research.

450746

METHOD

In order to obtain maximum feedback from short term training experiences, a quasi-experimental design was utilized to evaluate the project. Specifically, a modified time-series approach was applied to the training efforts as they evolved.

Due to the short duration of the project, no before and after measures were taken. Both hard and soft data were collected and emphasis was placed upon feedback from participants regarding the training experience. The evaluation also focused upon the educational processes as they took place, particularly upon leader-participant interactions. A trained observer attended all training sessions in order to obtain evaluation data.

The objectives of the training sessions, or workshops, were to train groups of up to thirty persons each in programming, training, and consultation concerning the essential needs of infants and toddlers. The following measures were used in evaluating the workshops:

(a) Rating of attention paid by participant to learning task. Time-on-task was rated as "involved," "moderately involved," or "uninvolved" for each participant during 10-second observation periods.

(b) Analysis of leader-participant interactions during each session. Ratings of interactions according to Flanders' schema (Amidon, E.J. and Flanders, N.A. (Eds.) Interaction analysis: theory, research and application. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1967.) were performed. Each rating covered a 15 minute segment.

(c) Participants' assessment of content usefulness and leader effectiveness were obtained through a 16-item Likert scale completed by participants.

(d) A daily log or running account of daily events was kept by Center personnel.

(e) Participants' assessment of usefulness of workshop experience after returning to the job. A 12-item open-ended questionnaire was mailed to each workshop participant three weeks after he/she returned home.

(f) Participants' assessment of the usefulness of selected publications distributed at the workshop. This was determined by a Likert-type scale included in the follow-up questionnaire.

This report presents a general summary of findings for each of the two workshops, and then a summary and conclusions section for the evaluation as a whole.

WORKSHOP VIII

"PROGRAM ESSENTIALS OF INFANT-TODDLER CARE" (OCTOBER 23-27, 1972)

The Participants

Of the 18 participants attending the Workshop, sixteen were female and two were male. They ranged in age from 23 to 59 with six younger than 30 years and eight over 40 years old. Twelve of the participants were married, five were single, and one was separated. Six participants had no children of their own while five had three or more.

Twelve participants were from North Carolina; four were from Michigan; and one each came from Tennessee and New York City.

Seven of the participants were from North Carolina Departments of Social Services while five were associated with the Leadership Training Center for Child Care in Greensboro. The remaining six participants were affiliated with child care programs.

The group was a highly trained one, with five holding college degrees and eight holding graduate degrees. One-third of the participants primarily functioned as supervisors; five were involved in designing training programs; and five were involved in direct service to children as their primary responsibility. Seven participants rated training as their secondary responsibility while four rated direct service. Four participants were involved in supervision, two in consulting, and one in administration as their secondary responsibility.

Three participants had less than one year experience in child care work. Six had two years or less and one had three to five years of experience. Three of the participants had six to ten years experience in child care, three had more than ten years and two did not respond.

Results

Attention

Measures of attention or time-on-task were taken on a time series basis. Each person participating in the Workshop was measured a number of times for periods of ten seconds. If he/she was looking at the leader or taking notes for at least seven(7) of the ten seconds, he/she was scored as "involved" on the check sheet. If he/she was looking at the leader or taking notes for five (5) to seven (7) seconds, he/she was scored as "moderately involved." If less than five (5) seconds, he/she was scored as "uninvolved."

The data for attention or time-on-task measures were taken ten times, twice a day, during the course of the week. Attention remained at a high level throughout the Workshop. Table I, which summarizes these data, indicates that the participants were involved 85 percent of the time. The group ranged from a high of 92 percent involved during the fourth afternoon's program on in-service training to a low of 79 percent involved during the last afternoon when evaluation was the topic. Skillful recruitment by the staff and self-selection by individual participants most assuredly was reflected in the high level of attention throughout the Workshop.

TABLE I

Attention Measures by Number and Percent of Participants

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
Involved	14 82%	15 88%	16 89%	12 80%	12 86%	11 85%	12 86%	12 92%	12 80%	11 79%	127 85%
Moderately Involved	3 18%	1 6%	2 11%	3 20%	2 14%	2 15%	2 14%	1 8%	2 13%	2 14%	20 13%
Uninvolved	0 -	1 6%	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 7%	1 7%	3 2%

Interaction

A modified Flanders Interaction Analysis was used in evaluating the Workshop interactions. This was used as something of a tracking sheet for verbalizations by both leaders and participants and included the types of verbalizations uttered, i.e., questions, statements, lecture, etc. Scores on this measure were obtained on each day of the Workshop. The lecture technique was utilized at a moderate level throughout the Workshop, except on the third morning when it was employed to a greater degree. On this occasion the prepared talk was presented by two persons in an informal manner. Participant interest appeared to remain at a high level during this presentation. On the first day the interactions consisted of numerous questions asked by participants. These questions were understandable in that they followed an observation period in the Nursery. The second day's session involved not only the lecture technique but also participant response to questions posed by leaders and participant initiated talk. In the fifteen minute observation period on Thursday, the lecture method was again utilized. Interspersed throughout the lecture were participant questions. As would be expected by the end of the Workshop, Friday's interactions consisted mainly of participant initiated talk, which took the form of both questions and statements.

Throughout the Workshop considerable effort was made by the leaders to see that pertinent knowledge of various participants was made available to the entire group. The participants were encouraged by the Workshop leaders to recognize and utilize the amount of expertise available from fellow participants. On numerous occasions the Workshop leaders themselves incorporated participant ideas into their own presentations.

Content Usefulness and Leader Effectiveness

At the end of the second, third and fourth day of the Workshop, participants were asked to assess that day's session in terms of the overall content usefulness and leader effectiveness. Table 2 summarizes the data. All of the scores fell within the most favorable categories. This indicates that the participants were in considerable agreement as to the clarity of content, the opportunity for discussion and questions, the leaders' responsiveness to their needs, and the appropriateness and usefulness of the information to them on their job. All of the participants felt that the sessions were presented at their level. Two participants expressed doubt that the session on staff development would be useful for untrained caregivers or inexperienced caregivers. After the day's session on curriculum, two participants indicated that the session would not be very useful for an executive or administrator or for a mother caring for her own or other's children.

In the space provided for additional comments (see Appendix A), the majority of the participants added words of praise for the Workshop. They referred specifically to the helpfulness of the sessions and the interesting manner in which the material was presented. The participants repeatedly suggested that more time be alloted for small group discussions. Workshop leaders took note of these requests and appropriate changes were made in the agenda. There was a great deal of favorable reaction to the small groups which ensued. This was evidenced by the comments on Thursday's evaluative forms. The change in the agenda clearly indicates the willingness of the Workshop leaders to respond to the participants' needs.

TABLE 2

Ratings by Number and Percent of Participants on Content Usefulness and Leader Effectiveness

	Curriculum	Nutrition and Health	Staff Development
Appropriateness of content			
Highly	12 (75%)	11 (100%)	4 (44%)
Moderately	4 (25%)		3 (33%)
Neutral			2 (22%)
Very little			
Not at all			
Content Usefulness			
Highly	13 (81%)	11 (92%)	6 (60%)
Moderately	3 (19%)	1 (8%)	4 (40%)
Neutral			
Very little			
Not at all			
Content Clarity			
Highly	14 (87.5%)	12 (100%)	9 (90%)
Moderately	2 (12.5%)		1 (10%)
Neutral			
Very little			
Not at all			
Enough Opportunity to Discuss			
Highly	9 (56%)	9 (75%)	7 (70%)
Moderately	4 (25%)	3 (25%)	2 (20%)
Neutral	3 (19%)		1 (10%)
Very little			
Not at all			
Enough Opportunity to Ask Questions			
Highly	10 (62.5%)	9 (75%)	8 (80%)
Moderately	3 (18.75%)	3 (25%)	1 (10%)
Neutral	3 (18.75%)		1 (10%)
Very little			
Not at all			
Leader(s) Responded to Needs			
Highly	14 (88%)	9 (75%)	7 (70%)
Moderately	1 (6%)	3 (25%)	2 (20%)
Neutral	1 (6%)		1 (10%)
Very little			
Not at all			

Daily Log

Both attendance and promptness by participants at the Workshop sessions was consistently good. The group was initially quiet and reserved but soon they warmed up to the day's activities. A number of questions were asked by the participants after returning from an observation period in the Nursery. The group seemed to thoroughly enjoy the slide series "Hidden Treasures." The attention level was high during the presentation.

There was a great deal of interest in the second day's session on curriculum. A high level of involvement in sharing ideas occured. A spirited discussion arose regarding curriculum and licensing agencies. At times one or two participants tended to dominate the discussion. However, no animosity among group members was present.

The third day centered around nuitrition and health. Group involvement seemed slow to develop but by mid-afternoon the majority of the participants were actively engaged in discussion.

Workshop participants spent a portion of the fourth day perusing publications. They utilized the free time period to share ideas and interact with one another. The small group discussion sessions proved to be extremely successful. Participants always seemed to welcome the opportunity to discuss and interact with one another.

Interest in the final day's session on evaluation was good. As the day progressed, though, interest began to wane. This was perhaps due to fatigue of the group.

Throughout the Workshop participants were encouraged by the leaders to recognize and utilize the expertise available from fellow group members. In addition, the Workshop leaders were most sensitive to the groups' needs and requests.

Follow-Up Assessment

Short, anonymous follow-up questionnaires were mailed to the Workshop participants three weeks after the Workshop. The Workshop leaders were particularly interested in securing information about the Workshop from the participants after they had returned to their respective jobs. Sixty-one percent (11) of the questionnaires were returned. The results of the questions are summarized in Table 3. Some of the more pertinent findings are summarized as follows:

1. All of the respondents agreed that they had obtained from the Workshop the kinds of information they had anticipated receiving. This is due largely to the fact that the Workshop leaders clearly spelled out this information in their initial announcements regarding the Workshop.

2. The greatest number (4) of participants felt that the most valuable session or experience was the one on curriculum.

3. Seven respondents indicated that they had implemented some of the ideas gained from the Workshop. Three respondents had not utilized Workshop ideas as of the time when they received the follow-up questionnaires, but each indicated that he/she planned to do so. One respondent reported that he/she had incorporated Workshop ideas into his/her own thinking but did not plan to implement them.

4. All of the respondents agreed that the presentation by the leaders was clear.

5. The respondents rated the content of the Workshop and the presentation by the leaders as either good or excellent.

In the space provided for additional comments and suggestions, the majority of the participants added words of praise for the entire Workshop. The only suggestions pertained to more interaction time. That is, participants

TABLE 3
Summary of Responses to Follow-Up Questionnaire

Did you obtain the kind of information you anticipated receiving?	Yes 11 (100%)	No 0				
Most valuable session or experience:	Health and Safety 3 (27%)	Staff Development 1 (9%)	Curriculum 4 (37%)	Evaluation 1 (9%)	Observations 1 (9%)	Sharing Ideas 1 (9%)
Least valuable session or experience:	Administering Child Care Programs 2 (18%)	Curriculum 1 (9%)	Evaluation 1 (9%)	All Good 4 (36%)	No Response 3 (27%)	
Have you been able to or do you plan to implement ideas gained from the Workshop?	Yes 7 (64%)	No 1 (9%)	Not Yet 3 (27%)			
Were there any ideas that you wanted to implement but could not?	Yes 1 (9%)	No 9 (82%)	No Response 1 (9%)			
Was there an area not covered which you wanted covered?	Yes 3 (27%)	No 7 (64%)	No Response 1 (9%)			
Was the presentation clear?	Yes 11 (100%)	No 0				
	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor		
Content was:	6 (55%)	5 (45%)	0	0		
Presentation was:	4 (36%)	7 (64%)	0	0		

felt more time was needed earlier in the week for participant interaction with one another.

Follow-Up Assessment of Materials

Included in the follow-up questionnaires were questions regarding the materials which were distributed in the Workshop. The Workshop participants were asked to evaluate these materials in terms of their helpfulness. Table 4 summarizes their responses.

TABLE 4
Material Usefulness by Number and Percent

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Very Helpful	Don't Know
Beginning with Infants	7(64%)	2(18%)		2(18%)
Children in Day Care with Focus on Health	7(64%)	3(27%)		1(9%)
When Kids Fight Over Toys	4(36%)	6(55%)		1(9%)
Soul Mother	4(36%)	6(55%)		1(9%)
Some Aids ... for those who work with infants and toddlers	7(64%)	2(18%)		2(18%)
Health is Everything	6(55%)	4(36%)		1 (9%)
The Good Life for Infants and Toddlers	7(64%)	3(27%)		1(9%)
Talk with Baby	7(64%)	3(27%)		1(9%)
Babies Touch, Taste, and Learn	5(45.5%)	5(45.5%)		1(9%)
What Parents Should Look For ...	4(36%)	5(46%)	1(9%)	1(9%)
OCD Day Care Series #2 Serving Infants	9(82%)	1(9%)		1(9%)
Easy-To-Do Toys and Activities for Infants and Toddlers	8(73%)	2(18%)		1(9%)

WORKSHOP IX

"INFANT-TODDLER CARE --- TRAINING AND CONSULTATION" (JANUARY 15-19, 1973)

The Participants

Twenty-nine persons attended Workshop IX. Of that number nineteen came from North Carolina and four from Tennessee. Two participants each came from Michigan and West Virginia and one each from Kentucky and Washington, D.C. The Workshop included thirteen participants from Head Start programs and twelve from North Carolina Departments of Social Services.

Of the twenty-nine participants, twenty-eight were female and only one was male. They ranged in age from 22 years to 62 years old. Twelve were 30 years or younger, six were 40 years or younger and five were 50 years or younger. Six participants were over 50 years of age. Eight of the Workshop participants were single while the majority were or had been married (18 married, one divorced, one separated, and one widowed).

The group was heavily weighted with persons who had had considerable experience and education in the field. Ten participants had had more than three years experience in child care work and ten had had more than ten years experience. Thirteen participants held college degrees and seven held graduate degrees. Seven persons had attended a college or community college and two had received high school diplomas.

The largest number (11) of participants were involved in administrative functions as their primary job responsibility. The remaining eighteen were involved in supervisory (6), direct service (9), and training (3) functions. In terms of secondary responsibilities, six were involved in direct service, eleven in supervisory work, two in administrative activities, one in other work, and nine did not respond.

Results

Attention

Attention measures or time-on-task were taken nine times during the course of the week, twice a day and once on the last day of the Workshop. Time-on-task, or attention, was rated as "involved," "moderately involved," or "uninvolved" for each participant. Table 5 summarizes the data.

Attention remained at a relatively high level throughout the week. This is somewhat surprising in view of the fact that group members represented distinct and diverse job orientations. One might expect persons from one orientation or the other to be bored or uninvolved during particular sessions.

Participants were involved in the sessions 86 percent of the time and less than 3 percent of the time were they uninvolved in the sessions. The group ranged from 93 percent involved during the first morning's introductory session to a low of 80 percent involved during the second afternoon's program when training was the topic.

TABLE 5

Attention Measures by Number and Percent of Participants

Measure	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Total
Involved	28 93%	21 84%	23 85%	20 80%	24 88%	21 84%	20 87%	20 83%	12 92%	189 86%
Moderately Involved	1 3%	3 12%	4 15%	3 12%	3 12%	3 12%	2 9%	4 17%	1 8%	24 11%
Uninvolved	1 3%	1 4%	0 -	2 8%	0 -	1 4%	1 4%	0 -	0 -	6 3%

Interaction

Analyses of leader-participant interactions were made during each day of the Workshop. Interactions were rated according to Flander's schema. Each rating covered a 15-minute segment.

On the first day the interactions consisted mainly of participant initiated comments and questions. Participant talk early in the week was not surprising in light of the fact that it followed an observation period in the Nursery. The lecture method was utilized heavily during Tuesday's sampling period. The majority of the verbalizations were uttered by the leaders. There was little interaction between participants and leaders. Wednesday's session was characterized by both leader and participant verbalizations. Participants' ideas were very often reflected in the utterances of the leaders. Again, on Thursday, the lecture method was utilized quite heavily. Evidence of this was in the small number of participant-leader interactions. Friday's sampling period was characterized by the greatest number of participant comments.

One additional point should be noted. It was evident that the participants in the Workshop varied both the quality and quantity of their verbalizations and interactions with the variation in leaders.

Content Usefulness and Leader Effectiveness

The workshop participants were asked to rate Tuesday's, Wednesday's, and Thursday's sessions in terms of the content usefulness and leader effectiveness. Table 6 summarizes these data. Tuesday's session on training was rated by most participants as being very or moderately useful and appropriate. However, one person indicated that the content was not useful or appropriate. Two persons felt that there had not been enough opportunity to discuss or ask

TABLE 6

Ratings by Number and Percent of Participants on Content Usefulness and Leader Effectiveness

	Training	Consultation	Staff Relationships
Appropriateness of Content:			
Highly	12 (46%)	21 (78%)	15 (71%)
Moderately	12 (46%)	5 (19%)	6 (29%)
Neutral	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	
Very little	1 (4%)		
Not at all			
Content Usefulness:			
Highly	15 (58%)	20 (74%)	16 (76%)
Moderately	9 (35%)	6 (22%)	4 (19%)
Neutral	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (5%)
Very little	1 (4%)		
Not at all			
Content Clarity:			
Highly	22 (85%)	23 (88%)	19 (95%)
Moderately	4 (15%)	3 (12%)	1 (5%)
Neutral			
Very little			
Not at all			
Enough Opportunity to Discuss:			
Highly	19 (83%)	19 (73%)	12 (55%)
Moderately	2 (9%)	5 (19%)	7 (32%)
Neutral		1 (4%)	1 (5%)
Very little	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	2 (9%)
Not at all	1 (4%)		
Enough Opportunity to Ask Questions:			
Highly	20 (77%)	19 (70%)	13 (59%)
Moderately	2 (8%)	6 (22%)	6 (27%)
Neutral	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	2 (9%)
Very little	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	1 (5%)
Not at all			
Leader(s) Responded to Needs:			
Highly	11 (50%)	19 (76%)	12 (60%)
Moderately	4 (18%)	4 (16%)	6 (30%)
Neutral	7 (32%)	1 (4%)	1 (5%)
Very little		1 (4%)	1 (5%)
Not at all			

questions. When asked if leaders responded to their needs, seven persons marked "neutral." The fact that these participants did not respond either positively or negatively is significant and conveys in itself a type of negative response.

In the space provided for additional comments (see Appendix B), reactions were varied. Some said that the session was'stimulating'and'informative', while others regarded it as'repitious'and'boring'. One participant seemed to sum up the general attitude by writing "the session was valuable for Head Start but not as relevant for other day care situations."

The participants were in considerable agreement as to the appropriateness and usefulness of both Wednesday's and Thursday's sessions. The scores fell within the favorable categories on both days. There was less agreement, though, when asked if there had been enough opportunity for questions and discussion. One person in each session felt that the leaders weren't particularly responsive to his/her needs. No additional comments were provided by these persons as to why they felt that way.

Additional comments regarding Wednesday's session (see Appendix B) were all favorable. They ranged from 'very informative' to 'wished it could have continued longer.' The recurring comment after Thursday's session was 'not enough time for discussion.'

There was general agreement by all of the participants that portions of the Workshop would be inappropriate for untrained caregivers, inexperienced caregivers or mothers caring for their own or other's children. Such opinion seems clearly reasonable considering the work responsibilities to which the Workshop was geared.

Daily Log

The attendance at each session, with the exception of the last day, was good and the participants were generally prompt . There was a great deal of interaction during the first day's session. Many individuals asked questions which were answered by the leaders. Other participants offered their own ideas on various topics.

The second day's presentation offered quite a contrast to the first day's. A number of techniques were utilized by the program's presenters. These were generally very direct approaches. There appeared to be varied reactions by the participants to the presentation. The reactions were explained largely by job orientation. Some participants were accustomed to this type of presentation while others were not.

Wednesday's session on consultation proved to be very popular. The Workshop leaders stimulated a great deal of discussion and interaction. They also encouraged participants to relate their own personal experiences as they related to the topic.

A portion of Thursday was given over to browsing through various child care publications and materials. Participants seemed to welcome this opportunity. Later in the day the large group broke into smaller discussion groups. The majority of the participants were involved in discussion.

The last day's session was characterized by a good deal of participant interaction. The small groups facilitated this type of interaction. The participants always seemed to wlecome the opportunity to discuss and interact with fellow participants. Workshop leaders apparently recognized this as evidenced by numerous occasions when small groups were utilized.

Follow-Up Assessment

Sixty-nine percent (20) participants returned the follow-up questionnaires. Short, anonymous questionnaires followed the Workshop by no more than three weeks. The Workshop leaders felt that the information provided by the participants after returning to their respective jobs would be extremely beneficial and relevant in planning future workshops. Table 7 summarizes the responses. Some of the more pertinent findings are summarized as follows:

1. The majority (16) of the participants agreed that they had received from the Workshop the kinds of information they anticipated receiving. Two obtained some of what they expected receiving but two participants did not receive the kinds of information that had been anticipated. This is somewhat surprising in that Workshop leaders were careful to clearly indicate this type of information in the initial announcements concerning the Workshop.

2. The greatest number of participants (8) felt that the most valuable session was the one on the uses and abuses of consultation.

3. All participants (20) after returning to their jobs indicated that they had implemented or planned to implement ideas they had gained from the Workshop.

4. Nineteen respondents reported that the Workshop presentation was clear. One said it was not.

5. In terms of the Workshop content, seventeen participants rated it as either good or excellent. Three said the content was adequate.

6. The Workshop presentation was rated as either good or excellent eighteen participants. Two rated the presentation as adequate.

TABLE 7

Summary of Responses to Follow-Up Questionnaire

Did you obtain the kind of information you anticipated receiving?	Yes	No	Some						
	16 (80%)	2 (10%)	2 (10%)						
Most valuable session or experience:	Introductory Remarks	Crucial Issues	Uses and Abuses of Consultation	Staff Relationships	Problem Clinic	Sharing Ideas	Training		
	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	8 (40%)	3 (15%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	4 (20%)		
Least valuable session or experience:	Introductory Remarks	Observations	Uses and Abuses of Consultation	Staff Relationships	Problem Clinic	Training	All Good		
	2 (10%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	2 (10%)	8 (40%)	4 (20%)		
Have you been able to or do you plan to implement ideas gained from the Workshop?	Yes	No							
	20 (100%)	0							
Were there any ideas that you wanted to implement but could not?	Yes	No	No Response						
	12 (60%)	6 (30%)	2 (10%)						
Was there an area not covered which you wanted covered?	Yes	No	No Response						
	4 (20%)	15 (75%)	1 (5%)						
Was the presentation clear?	Yes	No							
	19 (95%)	1 (5%)							
	Excellent	Good	Adequate	Poor					
Content was:	9 (45%)	8 (40%)	3 (15%)	0					
Presentation was:	8 (40%)	10 (50%)	2 (10%)	0					

Follow-Up Assessment of Materials

A portion of the follow-up questionnaire was concerned with questions pertaining to the materials which were distributed in the Workshop. The participants were asked to evaluate these materials in terms of their helpfulness. Table 8 summarizes their responses.

TABLE 8

Material Usefulness by Number and Percent

	Very Helpful	Helpful	Not Very Helpful	Don't Know
Beginning with Infants	6(30%)	10(50%)	2(10%)	2(10%)
Learning and Teaching in a Center for the Care of Infants and Toddlers	7(35%)	9(45%)	2(10%)	2(10%)
Project Head Start Training Courses and Methods	6(30%)	7(35%)	5(25%)	2(10%)
UNC-G Demonstration Project Group Care of Infants and Toddlers: Staff Responsibilities and Job Descriptions	8(49%)	6(30%)	3(15%)	3(15%)
The Good Life for Infants and Toddlers	6(30%)	10(50%)	2(10%)	2(10%)
Children in Day Care with Focus on Health	3(15%)	13(65%)	2(10%)	2(10%)

CONCLUSIONS

Workshop VIII on "Program Essentials of Infant-Toddler Care" can be regarded as very successful in terms of all the objective measures taken as well as in terms of an overall, global assessment of the sessions by the evaluation team. The follow-up questionnaires which were mailed to the Workshop participants after they returned to their respective jobs proved to be a valuable source of information for the evaluation team and for the Workshop leaders. Questionnaire responses and overall assessment of the Workshop indicated that it was highly effective and beneficial.

Workshop IX on "Training and Consultation Aspects of Infant-Toddler Care" also proved to be successful. Again, follow-up questionnaires were used in making this assessment. One point, however, should be mentioned. The diverse orientations of Workshop participants led to differential satisfaction with the content usefulness of particular sessions.

It was apparent, in both Workshops, that the participants varied their verbalizations and interactions with the variation in leaders. This was more evident in Workshop IX, though. Throughout each Workshop the leaders, for the most part, were extremely sensitive to the needs and requests of the Workshop participants.

Providing a variety of experiences in the course of each Workshop proved to be very valuable. By combining lecture sessions with audio-visual presentations, browsing time, observation periods, free time, and so forth, a great deal was accomplished. The most effective approaches were ones where a brief introductory lecture was followed by an open discussion period or small group discussion period. Participants also welcomed informal presentations by one or more of the Workshop leaders.

During each Workshop the leaders made considerable effort to see that

knowledge of particular group members was shared and made avaliable to other participants. They were also very much aware of the fact that the participants gained a great deal from interacting with one another.

All indices pointed to a high degree of involvement on the part of the majority of the participants for both Workshops. Attention levels were quite high throughout both weeks. The majority of the participants of both Workshops regarded the expereince as very beneficial and worthwhile.

APPENDIX A

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS BY SESSIONS

WORKSHOP VIII

CURRICULUM

Historical background of infant project was good. Orientation was excellent and was surpassed only by the opportunity to observe in the Nursery Center.

Session gave me a better understanding of the word curriculum. Should be very helpful in our daily care. Thanks.

Very helpful and enjoyable. Much information was given and shown.

I would have liked to have seen small group discussion, more interaction between participants.

Very good.

Excellent slide presentation.

Would like to have had more time for group discussion.

Very helpful.

Very informative. Slides were helpful in reinforcing daily program plan.

Very good to be able to talk and ask questions of those who work in the infant care program daily. Short slides and films helped very much to bring out the discussion.

NUITRITION AND HEALTH

Excellent session.

Much needed and very beneficial information.

Very helpful.

I wish this workshop lasted for two weeks instead of one so as to get more time for discussion.

Very good and helpful. Information was new to me.

More discussion time is needed.

Miss Reid has a great way of presenting the material.

Information was very fruitful and should be of help to ones in our program.

Miss Reid did an excellent job of communicating the important aspects of nuitrition and health.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Just great, with many useful points being brought out and discussed.

The group discussion was very interesting to me.

Small group discussion was very interesting.

Small group discussions today were most informative. These types of groups would have been helpful at the beginning of the workshop.

Breaking into small groups was very effective; all materials and ideas shared were meaningful and helpful.

I think the sessions would have been more beneficial had they been divided into groups dealing with specific areas.

Information was very important and needed for executives and directors. Very helpful to those who have to choose or decide on other staff members.

The morning session on resources was particularly good as I am not very familiar with infant-toddler resources. The small group work provided much needed interaction and sharing. The afternoon was interesting but not as helpful.

APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS BY SESSIONS

WORKSHOP IX

TRAINING

Some phases did not seem realistic such as training cook, etc. It sounds great but is it really done?

The material was common sense and it became boring to stretch it out. Both speakers' voices were too piercing or high pitched, destroying the low key approach set in Monday's session. It almost seemed like too many techniques were used, along with too many lists and charts. Meaningful narration or discussion might have been more useful.

I felt that there was too much leadership and structure to this portion of the program. I'm talking about the morning session. There was not enough sharing. It was too much of a lecture.

Would have liked more question and answer time.

I felt the session was very repetitious and boring. The most interesting aspect for me was listening to what other people in the field are doing in areas of training. I felt the basic information given was good but, again, it was much too repetitious. I think that some people did not have enough opportunity to discuss.

Quite informative.

Very stimulating.

Very good, applicable and stimulating.

Very helpful.

I especially enjoyed the part about staff development coordination.

The session was valuable for Head Start but not as relevant for other day care situations.

Was a learning experience.

Good.

CONSULTATION

One of the things I needed most from this workshop.

D. Kiester was excellent. Afternoon session was just as good.

Very helpful. Wished it could have lasted longer.

The session was very interesting and I feel it will be very helpful in the future.

Most interesting presentation.

Very good.

Very informative.

This session and the first day have been the most helpful so far this week.

The first part of the morning was very appropriate but there should have been some follow-up or actual work sessions that afternoon to reinforce some of the things mentioned by D. Kiester. D. Kiester's session was very good. I feel that too many times the statement "we will not have time to do this" is a reflection on planning the workshop. Some of the things that we did not have time for I feel were very important in a workshop setting, such as role playing. It might have been that too much was crowded into the sessions.

I found this session to be very interesting, however, I am not sure that my agency is ready to accept this method of using consultants.

Both morning and afternoon sessions were very good.

I felt this session with Dorothy Kiester was very good. Her knowledge of her subject and her delivery were excellent.

Conversation was very meaningful. A lot was said in a concise manner.

This session was excellent.

STAFF RELATIONSHIPS

Dr. Keister is grand. Mrs. Mazyck is very sensitive to our needs. I feel that she can tell when the group is bored or paying close attention. I was frustrated this afternoon due to the acoustics and not enough time was available for discussion. During the entire day the content was excellent and leaders were most perceptive to the group needs.

The afternoon buzz session should have been longer. There was not enough time for group discussion.

I enjoyed the personal, historical experiences related by Keister and Barbour. More time to look at the resource table would have been good. The resources will probably help me the most when I get back to my job.

I particularly enjoyed browsing through the resource materials. Also enjpyed the discussion of professionals in child care.

Very good and informative.

Discussion groups had just begun when time was up and we had to stop.

The session was interesting and should prove to be very helpful. Time has been the only factor that has cut the effectiveness of the program. The program has thus far been very beneficial.

Not enough time for discussion.

I feel very fortunate to have been a part of the morning session. I do intend to carry the information on staff relationships back to my staff. Hopefully, something can be gained.